

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8 and 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,965,440 to Nakagiri in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,934,046 to Nishikawa, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0075865 to Kato, U.S. Patent No. 6,894,792 to Abe. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action concedes that Nakagiri does not teach wherein the connection information does not comprise real image data but relates to processing of the image data of the connected job and a display component that displays the connection information without generating real image data of the connected job. The Office Action asserts that Nishikawa, Kato and Abe remedy these shortfalls of Nakagiri. The analysis of the Office Action fails for the following reason.

Claims 1 and 11 recite, among other features, wherein the job connection component includes information designated by a user as to whether an original print job corresponding to the respective one of the plurality of jobs should be deleted from in the memory and whether the connected job should be stored in the memory, when the jobs stored in the memory are selected and generation of the connected job is instructed. The Office Action asserts that the combination of Nakagiri with Kato teaches these features.

The Office Action asserts that Nakagiri teaches at paragraph col. 21, lines 12-24 that the job connection component includes information designated by a user as to whether an original print job corresponding to the respective one of the plurality of jobs should be deleted from the memory, as recited in claims 1 and 11. Nakagiri teaches in this portion that in case of the combine operation, the job order can be sorted desirably, and a desired job can be deleted from the target jobs. Thus, Nakagiri teaches deleting or not deleting a job. Nakagiri would not have suggested that the job connection component includes information designated

by a user as to whether an original print job corresponding to the respective one of the plurality of jobs should be deleted. Nakagiri has no need to include any information as to the deletion or not of a job because any job is deleted immediately. Claims 1 and 11 recite the job deleted when generation of the connected job is instructed.

The Office Action asserts that Kato teaches the above features recited in claims 1 and 11 at paragraphs [0058] - [0073] and Figs. 6 and 7. These portions of Kato merely teach a garbage collector that assesses if a job has been completed, and, if a job has been completed, that deletes the job from the hard disk drive. The garbage collector also assesses if a particular job is part of a combined job and then does not delete this job until the combined job is printed (see, *e.g.*, paragraphs [0069] and [0070]). Kato would not have suggested a user designating any information in any job connection component regarding deleting any file because the garbage collector of Kato does not request any input from a user. Further, the deletion of a job in Kato is executed when the job is printed. Kato would not have suggested designating any information regarding deleting a job when generation of the connected job is instructed. Any combined jobs of Kato are deleted by the garbage collector after they are combined and executed not as they are combined.

Thus, no combination of Nakagiri with Kato would have suggested the above features recited in claims 1 and 11. Nishikawa and Abe do not remedy the shortfalls of Nakagiri and Kato.

Claims 1 and 11, recite among other features, that a warning is generated if the user designates to delete the respective one of the plurality of jobs from the memory when the user designates not to store the connected job in the memory. The Office Action concedes that Nakagiri, Nishikawa and Kato do not teach this feature. The Office Action asserts that Abe teaches this feature at, col. 13, lines 30-35. In this portion, Abe teaches a confirmation message being displayed when a user attempts to delete a job. The user responds with a

delete or cancel command. Thus, contrary to the assertions made by the Office Action, Abe would not have suggested if the user designates a respective one of the plurality of jobs and when the user designates not to store the connected job. Abe merely provides a warning whenever any job is selected to be deleted by a user, and the pending claims would not have provided a warning if the job is not a part of a connected job.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the combination of Nakagiri with Nishikawa, Kato and Abe cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 1 and 11. Further, the combination of Nakagiri with Nishikawa, Kato and Abe cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 2-8 and 12-18 for at least the dependence of these claims on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-8 and 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagiri in view of Nishikawa, Kato, Abe are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 9, 10, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagiri as modified by Nishikawa, Kato, Abe and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,618,566 to Kujirai. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action concedes that Nakagiri, Nishikawa, Kato and Abe do not teach wherein, when a password is set for a selected job stored in the memory, and, when a password which coincides with the set password is input. The Office Action asserts that Kujirai remedies these shortfalls of Nakagiri, Nishikawa, Kato and Abe. As argued above, Nakagiri, Nishikawa, Kato and Abe cannot reasonably be considered to have suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 1 and 11. Therefore, the combination of Nakagiri with Nishikawa, Kato, Abe and Kujirai cannot reasonably be considered to have


suggested the combinations of all of the features recited in claims 9, 10, 19 and 20 for at least the dependence of these claims on allowable base claims, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9, 10, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakagiri as modified by Nishikawa, Kato, Abe and further in view of Kujirai are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-20 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John S. Kern
Registration No. 42,719

JAO:MIL/add

Date: September 18, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--